DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 149 SP 027 085

AUTHOR Pigge, Fred L.; Lovett, Martha T.
TITLE Job Performance and Job Satisfaction of Beginning Teachers.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Elementary School Teachers; *Job Performance; *Job Satisfaction; Secondary School Teachers; Special Education Teachers; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Bowling Green State University OH

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine the relationships between various indices of job performance and job satisfaction of the first-year teacher. It also examined the possibility that job satisfaction of beginning teachers might vary among elementary, secondary, specialized and special education teaching fields. Subjects were 154 graduates of the Bowling Green State University (BGSU) college of education. An indication of job satisfaction was derived from the Johnson Scale of Job Satisfaction. Job performance was determined by composite evaluations completed by: (1) the first-year teachers themselves; (2) their principals or supervisors; (3) their students; and (4) BGSU faculty who went on-site and observed their teaching. An analysis of the findings includes comparisons between the results of this study and those of previous studies. In a discussion of the implications of this study, it is suggested that an organized building or grade-level "Induction Committee" of one or two experienced teachers might promote greater job satisfaction and performance on the part of beginning teachers. References and two tables are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED265149

JOB PERFORMANCE AND JOB SATISFACTION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

Fred L. Pigge
Professor or Education
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio

and

Martha T. Lovett
Associate Professor of Education
College of Mount St. Joseph
Cincinnati, Ohio

SP 027 085

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Pigge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Abstract

Job Performance and Job Satisfaction

Of Beginning Teachers

The primary purpose of this study was to ascertain the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction of first-year teachers who were graduates of Bowling Green State University. A secondary purpose was to examine, compare, and contrast job satisfaction indices of these teachers by their teaching area, namely elementary, specialized, secondary, and special education.

JOB PERFORMANCE AND JOB SATISFACTION

OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

Does the perceived job performance of teachers affect their morale? Is teacher job satisfaction a legitimate concern for present-day teacher educators and administrators? Does the level of job satisfaction of beginning teachers vary among teaching areas? The findings of this study will lead the reader to answer `yes' to each of these questions.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to answer two questions:

1. What are the relationships (and the implications thereof) between various indices of job performance and job satisfaction of first-year teachers?
2. Does the job satisfaction of first-year teachers vary among these teaching fields: elementary, specialized, secondary, and special education?

Procedures

During the spring of 1981, the 301 June and August, 1980 Bowling Green State University (BGSU) teacher education graduates who were full-time teachers in Ohio were requested, by mail correspondence, to cooperate with a planned follow-up evaluation study. One-hundred fifty-four (154) of the 252 respondents agreed to cooperate with the requirements of the follow-up study. The teachers were required (1) to submit to an on-site evaluation of their teaching by a university faculty

member; (2) to permit and assist in the collection of classroom performance evaluations from their pupils, peers, and principals (or department heads or supervisors); and (3) to complete the Johnson Scale of Job Satisfaction and two self-evaluations of their teaching and classroom performances.

Approximately 100 of the 252 respondents were not willing to be observed or were teaching in a situation which did not lend itself to observation (e.g., a speech therapist working in three school districts and with a teacher-pupil ratio of one-to-one; a teacher of an emotionally disturbed class who did not want to "excite" her pupils with a stranger in the classroom, etc.). Out of the original population of 301, 51% were willing to cooperate with the study requirements, 33% were not willing (some had good reasons, but most did not comment), and 16% did not respond.

The 154 teachers who were willing to cooperate with the various facets of the study were stratified by their teaching area. A random sample consisting of 40 percent of each stratified group was selected. The 62 first-year teachers that were selected in this manner were distributed among these four broad teaching areas: (1) elementary (10), (2) secondary (12), (3) specialized (art, music, etc.)(20), and (4) special education (20).

Instrumentation

An indication of job satisfaction was derived from the Johnson Scale of Job Satisfaction (presented and reviewed in

Robinson, et.al., 1969). Job performance was determined by composite evaluations completed by: (1) the first-year teachers themselves, (2) their principals or supervisors, (3) their students, and (4) BGSU faculty who went on-site and observed the teaching of these first-year teachers.

Job performance measurements were obtained from three instruments and five sets of raters. One instrument, labeled "University Faculty Competency Evaluation Form" (UFCEF), consisted of 42 statements describing (1) possible actions of the teacher in conducting a class (teaching strategies), (2) his/her use of interpersonal skills, and (3) the making and using of teaching plans and materials. A Likert-type response scale was used for each statement. This scale ranged from 1 (which signified that a teacher did not display any of the listed characteristics) to 5 (which signified that a teacher generally performed in the manner described in the elaboration of the item). Two sets of raters completed this form: (1) the university faculty who went on-site to observe the teachers and (2) the first-year teachers themselves, as one of two self-evaluations.

Two examples of questions found on this instrument are: (1) "Does the teacher use procedures which get learners initially involved in lessons?", and (2) "Does the teacher organize instruction to take into account differences among learners in their capabilities?" The work of Ellet and others (1980) influenced the response format and the competency

statements on the UFCEF.

A second instrument consisted of 43 statements that described selected performances of effective/successful teachers, as identified by Gibney and others (1980) from a state-wide survey of educators in Ohio. This instrument, which was completed by peer teachers, principals, and the first-year teachers themselves, was labeled "Peer/Principal Evaluation Form" (PPEF). Again, a Likert-type rating scale of 1 to 5 was used. An example of the type of statements included is, "The teacher uses effectively a variety of verbal and non-verbal classroom communication techniques."

The third instrument used in gathering teacher performance data was titled "Student Evaluation Form" (SEF) and was completed by students, fourth grade and above and non special education. (Thus, this data was not collected on elementary teachers who taught only in the primary grades or teachers who taught primary and/or intermediate special education classes.) It consisted of 30 statements, each answered by 'never,' 'sometimes,' or 'often.' An example of these statements is, "My teacher gives clear directions and explanations about my class work."

Copies of all the instruments, along with descriptions regarding their construction, validity, and reliability may be found in a study completed by Govett (1982).

Data Collection

Twenty-four (24) Bowling Green State University College of Education faculty members went on-site and observed the 62 teachers during April and early May, 1981. It should be noted

that these teachers were scattered throughout the State of Ohio. Each first-year teacher had started teaching in late August or early September of 1980 and by April had completed seven months of her/his first year of teaching.

Near the close of the faculty member's on-site visit, each first-year teacher was asked to complete and/or have their pupils complete and send to the university the following four forms: PPEF, UFCEF, SEF, and the Johnson Scale of Job Satisfaction.

The faculty members also contacted the principal or department head and a peer teacher of each first-year teacher's choice and asked these individuals to complete and send the PPEF forms to BGSU. Completed forms were received by June 30, 1981.

ACT scores and the overall college grade point averages for the first-year teachers were obtained from university records.

Findings

Performance and Satisfaction

A multiple correlation coefficient of .35 ($F = 2.65$, $p = .07$) was found between the total job satisfaction scores as the dependent variable and the four measures of job performance as the independent or predictor variables. These four performance measures were ratings on the total instruments from principals, peer teachers, university faculty, and pupils.

Table 1 presents the zero-order correlations that were found between the teachers' total job satisfaction scores and

the various performance measures. It also presents other pertinent correlations such as those between the various performance measures. In this latter regard, the first-year teachers themselves, their principals, and their peers tended to agree quite highly as to the performance of the first-year teachers as measured by the PPEF instrument (r's of +.76 to +.90). On the UFCEF, the university faculty and the first-year teachers agreed to an extent indicated by an r of +.68. Principals and students agreed to a greater extent on the performance of the teachers (r = .57) than did peer teachers and students (r = .23). There were no significant correlations between ACT scores and the performance measures. Two correlations between performance and college grade point average were significant: (1) performance as estimated by university faculty (r = +.42) and (2) teachers' performance as recorded by their principals (r = +.35).

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Only two of the 18 correlations between the various performance measures and job satisfaction were significantly higher than zero. The strongest single predictor of teachers' job satisfaction scores, as shown in Table 1, was the performance ratings completed by their principals (r = +.33). Jacobs and Solomon (1977), Orpen (1978), Locke (1965), and O'Reilly (1979) argued the need for some evidence of achievement to produce job satisfaction. In concert with this argument and with the practices of traditional beginning teacher evaluation

and induction systems, the principals (or supervisors) had undoubtedly observed the performance of these teachers throughout the year and most of the teachers were aware, through continuous formal and informal means, of their principals' assessments of their job performance.

The second strongest single predictor of teacher satisfaction was the teachers' self-evaluations of their interpersonal skills ($r = +.27$). In other words, there was somewhat of a tendency for teachers who had higher job satisfaction scores to have rated themselves higher in the area of interpersonal skills (or vice versa). A related finding is further elaborated by Pigge and Reed (1985, pg. 24) who concluded from a follow-up study of 694 first through fifth-year teachers that the

> ...teachers' major priorities -- and their highest proficiencies --- at the end of their first year of teaching and continuing with successive years of experience are not instructional skills <u>per se</u>. Rather, they are abilities which might more appropriately be classified as interpersonal or human relations skills. It is these competencies, apparently, which are continuously emphasized and reinforced within the demands of the work setting.

<u>Teaching Area and Job Satisfaction</u>

Table 2 presents the teachers' scores from the Johnson Job Satisfaction Scale divided into its nine sub-topics with the

mean and standard deviation for each sub-topic. In order to show the relative weight of affirmative job satisfaction responses, the mean of each sub-topic was divided by the number of items it was based upon ($\bar{X}/i$). The computation of this (contributing) index was necessary to show the relationship of the sub-topics since the number of items varied from 3 to 26. This index is also presented for teachers from the four teaching areas (elementary, secondary, specialized, and special).

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The sub-topic contributing the least to job satisfaction for these first-year teachers was 'work relations with associates.' This was evident from the relatively low contributing index for the total group of teachers (.73) as well as for each of the sub-groups (elementary, .70; special, .77; specialized, .73; and secondary, .69).

Typical questions in this sub-topic were: (1) "In general, do you get along well with the persons with whom you work on the present job?" (2) "Do you feel that others could make your work easier if they cared to do so?" (3) "Do you feel that your associates stimulate you to do better work?"

The sub-topic contributing second least to overall job satisfaction included 11 questions pertaining to security, advancement, and finances. Typical questions were: (1) "Do you feel you are paid a fair salary?" (2) "Are you kept from living as you would like because of insufficient income?" (3) "Are you afraid of losing your job?" Data presented in Table 2 reveal

that for the total group, the contributing index for this sub-topic was .77. It also shows that the elementary and special education teachers were much more satisfied in this area (.82 and .85) than were the specialized and secondary teachers (.70 and .72).

For the total group of teachers, three sub-topics equally contributed the most to job satisfaction, each with a contributing index of .89: (1) training, status, (2) physical surroundings, and (3) evaluation of job choice. Two examples of questions from each of these three sub-topics, respectively, are: (1) "Do you feel you have had adequate preparation for the job you now hold?" (2) "Are you proud of your job and the work you do?" (3) "Do you consider your work surroundings to be as pleasant as they should be?" (4) "Do you feel your work ties you down or restricts your freedom too much?" (5) "Do you feel you have made a success of your job thus far in your career?" and (6) "If you could start over again, at 18, would you choose a different line of work?"

The elementary and special education teachers thought more highly of their training and status than did the secondary teachers; the specialized teachers were somewhat above the secondary but below the other two groups in this regard. The elementary teachers had the highest regard for their physical surroundings (.96); the specialized the least (.85). In an evaluation of their choice of a career, elementary and special education teachers were very positive in regard to their choices

(.96) while the specialized (.85) and secondary teachers (.79) were less sure of the wisdom of their choices.

The various contributing indices and the means presented in Table 2 reveal that special education teachers were most satisfied with teaching ($\bar{X}$ = 85.7) and the secondary teachers least satisfied ($\bar{X}$ = 75.3). Elementary ($\bar{X}$ = 82.8) and specialized teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 77.8) were between these two extremes.

These findings were congruent with those of Cox (1971) and Villeme and Hall (1980) which suggested elementary teachers had more job satisfaction than did secondary teachers; they are in conflict with Sergiovanni's (1966) conclusion that there was no satisfaction differences between elementary and secondary teachers. The difference in job satisfaction scores of the four teaching groups also supports Havens' (1963) and Schofield and Starts' (1979-80) contentions that the teaching profession cannot be studied as a single group. The latter study concluded "that different subject areas and grade levels may call for different qualities, understandings, and attitudes in teachers." The rather high satisfaction of most of these first-year teachers in their choice of a teaching career also supports Veenman's (1984) findings. In reviewing 83 studies done world-wide, he concluded that first-year teachers were not discontented, that a clear majority wanted to stay in the same school, and that approximately 70 percent would again choose a teaching career.

Summary

A modest multiple correlation of .35 (p = .07) was found

between first-year teachers' job satisfaction scores and four combined but independent estimates of their job performance. When examining zero-order correlations, it was found that significant positive correlations existed between teachers' job satisfaction scores and principal evaluations of their classroom performance ($r = +.33$, $p < .01$) and between the teachers' job satisfaction scores and self-evaluations of their interpersonal skills ($r = +.27$, $p < .05$).

The two sub-topics contributing the least to first-year teachers' job satisfaction were 'work relations with associates' and 'security, advancement, and finances.' The three sub-topics contributing the most to the teachers' positive job satisfaction scores were 'training, status,' 'physical surroundings' and 'evaluation of career choice.'

Special education teachers were most satisfied with teaching and secondary teachers were the least satisfied. In between these two extremes were the elementary and specialized teachers, with the elementary teachers more satisfied than the specialized teachers.

Possible Implications

A review of this and other pertinent studies will likely lead educators to assume that (1) satisfied teachers will be more productive than unsatisfied teachers, (2) performance produces satisfaction to a greater extent than the reverse, and (3) teacher satisfaction should be a concern for those who desire effective schools.

With these assumptions as a frame of reference, those who work with teachers should always be cognizant that recognition and evaluation cues do affect feelings of performance and thus affect satisfaction levels. Teachers who are continually apprised --- both verbally and non-verbally --- of jobs well done and of actions that were appreciated are much more likely to have higher job satisfaction than those not treated in this manner.

Also, the level of job satisfaction developed during teacher preparation and especially during the first year of experience is likely to carry through for succeeding years. In this regard, this study found that beginning teachers' work relations with teaching associates contributed the least to their job satisfaction. An organized building or grade-level "Induction Committee" of one or two experienced teachers whose primary purpose is to make the first year teacher's job as satisfying and successful as possible might be one effective way of assuring higher job satisfaction for the beginning teacher.

References

Cox, C. L. (1971). The measurement of teacher satisfaction. Dissertation Abstracts International.

Ellet, C. D., Copie, W. & Johnson, C. S. (1980). Assessing teacher performance. Journal of Educational Leadership, 38, 217-219.

Gibney, T., Dickson, G.E., & Wiersma, W. (1980). The identification of generic concepts of effective teaching as related to the Ohio standards: Final report - Phase 1. Columbus, OH: Ohio Study Council for Research and Evaluation, State Department of Education.

Havens, N. H. (1963). The relationship of organizational aspects and personal characteristics to teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University.

Jacobs, R. & Solomon, R. (1977). Strategies for enhancing the prediction of job performance from job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 417-421.

Locke, E. A. (1965). The Relationship of task success to task liking and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 379-385.

Lovett, M. T. (1982). Job performance and job satisfaction of beginning teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University.

O'Reilly, C. A. & Caldwell, D. (1970). Informational influences as a determinant of perceived task characteristics and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 157-165.

Orpen, C. (1978). Relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among western and tribal black employees. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 263-265.

Pigge, Fred L. and Reed, Patricia L. (1985, March). "A Follow-Up Study of Teachers' Needs, Proficiencies, and Sources of Proficiencies." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Robinson, J. P., Athanasion, R., & Head, K. (1969). Measures of occupational attitudes and occupational characteristics. Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, pp. 122-125.

Schofield, Hilary L. and Start, K. B. (1979-80). "Product Variables as Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, 48:130-6.

Sergiovanni, T. (1966). Satisfaction and dissatisfaction: Final Report (Project Report #BR5-8394). Washington, D.C.: Education Research Informational Center, United States Office of Education.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.

Villeme, Melvin G. and Hall, B. (1980). "The Relation of Teacher Attitude to Major, Employment Status, Teaching Level, and Satisfaction With Teaching for First-Year Teachers," The Humanist Educator, December, pp. 85-90.

TABLE 1

Zero-order Correlations Between Job Satisfaction and Various Measures of Job Performance and Ability

Job Performance Measures:	Job Satisfaction
(1) Peers' PPEF	.12
(2) Principals' PPEF	.33 ($p<.01$)
(3) Self PPEF	.06
(4) Faculty UFCEF	
Classroom Procedures	.15
Interpersonal Skills	.18
Teaching Strategies	.04
Total	.02
(5) Self UFCEF	
Classroom Procedures	.10
Interpersonal Skills	.27 ($p<.05$)
Teaching Strategies	.06
Total	.05
(6) Students' SEF	.21
Ability Measures:	
(7) ACT Composite	.11
English	.23
Math	.06
Social Science	.15
Natural Science	.03
(8) University Grade Point Average	.20

Other Pertinent Correlations*:

$r_{12}= .90$ $r_{13}= .76$ $r_{23}= .83$ $r_{45}= .68$

$r_{16}= .23$ $r_{26}= .57$ $r_{48}= .42$ $r_{28}= .35$

*subscripts refer to variables listed above

TABLE 2

Job Satisfaction of First-Year Teachers

Job Satisfaction Sub-Topics	Highest Score Possible [Items(i)]	Total Group $\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}/i$	$\bar{X}/i$ Elem	Spec Educ	Specialized Secondary
Physical, mental exertion	7	5.70	1.39	.81	.81	.86	.83 .73
Relations with associates	7	5.11	1.19	.73	.70	.77	.73 .69
Relations with administration	16	12.93	3.03	.81	.85	.87	.74 .78
Security, advancement, finances	11	8.46	2.07	.77	.82	.85	.70 .72
Emotional involvement	26	20.70	4.02	.80	.78	.87	.77 .73
Training, status	12	10.66	1.53	.89	.91	.95	.87 .80
Physical surroundings	10	8.91	1.53	.89	.96	.91	.85 .88
Goal progress	7	5.80	1.02	.83	.84	.89	.89 .74
Evaluation in retrospect	3	2.68	.58	.89	.96	.96	.85 .79
Total	99	80.9	11.43	.82	.84	.87	.79 .76
			Means		82.8	85.7	77.8 75.3
			SD		7.5	9.3	12.2 15.3

Range of Scores for Total Group Low - 36 High - 96